


Scientists or Media Whores Who Pretend to be Critics?

February 06, 2022



The 90th session [1] of the Corona Ausschuss was eagerly awaited by numerous loyal viewers and fans. After all, the announced topic promised explosive material.

Finally for the first time the prospect was raised of Dr. Wolfgang Wodarg, Dr. Stefan Lanka and Dr. Andrew Kaufman sharing a platform. Wow! If that wasn't going to be an exciting event, then what would be?!


As a result, at times there were 30-40,000 viewers following the live stream which lasted over 6 hours - the interest generated was comparable to that of a Champions League match!

After all, the topic was going to be nothing less than the question of whether the virus even exists! Thus, came the hope of finally receiving scientific proof for disease-causing viruses, or not - and being able to put an end to the whole nonsense, based on facts and what's more, legally supported!

However, what the viewers were actually subjected to was unparalleled in its absurdity - the attentive 'Zeitzeugen' (historical witnesses in real-time) were presented with an eye-opener 'par excellence' - on a silver platter.

It is with a certain sense of grief that I have to observe the suspicions long present in various quarters, namely, that the 'Corona Committee' production seems to be a kind of media whoring disguised as criticism, are becoming more substantiated. The reason being, there is blatantly not the slightest interest on the part of the committee in the most fundamental findings regarding the virus existence refutation, let alone using this information to bring a swift end to the *Plandemie*.

Astonished, we read on the Corona Committee's website under FAQs:



"We are committed to independent, transparent, and evidence-based analysis."

Ooops. For sure, the lack of evidence of a pathogenic virus was forgotten?

If people purport to being critical but do not pursue this attitude with consistency, only ever to the point permitted by the limits of their agenda, they deserve to be called media whores disguised as critics. Their behaviour is easy to see through. It manifests in personal attacks on the other and ridiculing - especially if and even more so - when the other person is able to provide far more suitable explanations and evidence.

This is why the entire Corona Committee and anyone who deliberately ignores facts and shrouds themselves in silence deserves nothing more than to be called media whores disguised as critics!

I now pose a few questions which illustrate why something isn't quite right here and who it is that is distracting from the real chances to finally end this pandemic:

- Why were none of the protagonists able to respond to our enquiry, to name a publication in which the scientific rules for the detection of a disease-causing virus are observed? (see the publication of part of our correspondence, everyone can make up his own mind - in black and white!) [3].
- Why does a committee, especially the lawyers, show disinterest regarding the fact that Dr. Stefan Lanka has already carried out several control experiments on SARS-CoV-2 in Swiss laboratories which were published, disproving the claims of all virologists? These claims include the cytopathic effect which was (mis)interpreted as 'viral'; the purely fictitious construction of a

viral genome, which does not occur in reality as a whole, and last but not least; the proof that any viral genome can be constructed from the raw sequence data published by the Chinese. [4] [5].

- Why is no one in the Corona Committee interested in the measles virus trial won by Dr. Stefan Lanka in 2016, an international, so-far unrepeated, first? The 1st Civil Senate of the BGH has confirmed the judgement of the Higher Regional Court of Stuttgart (OLG) of 16.02.2016. The court-appointed expert Prof. Dr. Dr. Podbielski explicitly confirmed on page 7 of the minutes [6] that the authors did not conduct any control experiments.

Dr Stefan Lanka already conducted the necessary and obligatory control experiments for the measles virus trial. These include demonstrating **cytopathic effect in monkey kidney cells which was wrongly interpreted as viral by virologists, and which is not caused by an alleged virus, but by the experimental set-up itself. And the nucleic acid sequence comparison.** For the trial, Dr. Stefan Lanka included the scientifically proven evidence that the published 'gene sequence' of the measles virus actually consists of theoretically assembled fragments of completely normal cell components. These fragments are produced in particularly large numbers when cells are killed in the test tube. Two recognised laboratories, including the world's largest and leading genetic institute, independently came to exactly the same results. [7] [8] [9]

- Why does the Corona Committee not care at all that our previously published correspondence with Prof. Bhakdi, Prof. Reiß and the entire virological research in Switzerland including its Corona Task Force, exposes their inadequacies? They even admit to their unscientific actions [3] and furthermore that they could not provide any evidence for SARS-CoV-2 and do NOT have their own isolate of a claimed pathogenic virus (which was previously claimed or assumed by Prof. Tanner) ...
- Why do Wodarg and his team ignore more than 150 requests made by Christine Massey to worldwide governments and their institutions to provide scientific proof of SARS-CoV-2 - from which it transpired that no one was actually able to do so? [10]
- Why doesn't anyone actually need **1.5 million euros**? Or is that still too little? Our **Isolate Truth Fund** guarantees the payment of this sum to a virologist who presents scientific proof of the existence of the Corona virus, including the documented control attempts of all steps taken in the proof? [11]
- Why has the Corona Committee swept all these findings under the carpet for almost two years, despite Viviane Fischer having already met with Dr. Lanka more than a year ago and despite our having written to Dr. Reiner Füllmich offering our support at any trial and in the Corona Committee? The latter refused on the grounds that he did not want to raise the issue of the existence of the virus. Despite the overwhelming evidence? Shouldn't this issue be of burning interest to any lawyer?

- Why does Dr. Wodarg continue to claim that the virus exists, although when asked, neither he nor Prof. Bhakdi (with whom he is in constant exchange) have been able to provide proof for it? [3]
- Why did Dr. Wodarg, according to his own statement at the 90th meeting of the Corona Committee, not engage with the publications of Dr. Stefan Lanka and Andrew Kaufman before the meeting? Should he not have done so if he had the slightest interest in the final clarification of the question of the existence of viruses? [1]
- Why does the committee allow incorrect claims by Dr. Wodarg to pass without subjecting them to critical scrutiny - are we in reality, watching a one-man show or satire?
- Why has the Corona Committee been chickening out of accepting all offers of constructive discussion with us for over a year now?
- Why does the Corona Committee choose the much bumpier and less effective way of focusing on the PCR test with the hope of removing the ground for future pandemics - why not start at the basis, the proven unscientific nature of virology, which is already obvious? We have already explained in one of our articles why an attack on the PCR test is not enough. [12]

And now we come to the most interesting aspect:

- **Why throughout this time has everybody refused to carry out the obligatory and prescribed control experiments in a laboratory, to film them, to document them and to publish them - together, as offered at Dr. Lanka's expense?**

And now, hand on heart: How can one seriously refuse something like this if one claims to be interested in truth and carries at least a spark of a scientific code of honour in one's chest? Even when success is pre-programmed - see control experiments in the measles virus trial. Everything has already been proven!

— — — — —

And why have we not written this article before now???

The question is completely justified, but easy to answer! For almost two years we have tried to enter into a constructive and purposeful discussion with all parties involved, but even **after promises and agreements that dialogue would eventually take place, this has not been honoured on their side.**

Those who still remember what happened during the height of HIV/AIDS criticism, where a well-known critic, Prof. Duesberg, distracted with his **bogus argument** from the essential point that

HIV was never isolated and that proof of it has not been provided to this day, thus maintaining the virus narrative, find themselves in déjà vu. Only the players have been exchanged. Dr. Wodarg's interactions, coupled with his characteristic stubbornness, prevent him from gaining important knowledge - and whether or not he knows how he is damaging the entire movement by doing so is a moot point.

In the case of AIDS, knowledge was successfully suppressed by the actions of very specific 'players'. This is exactly the reason why we find ourselves in a kind of repetition loop with Covid. That neither the PCR test nor any other test has any significance should have been known to everyone since HIV ...

Not only did Dr. Wodarg display a peculiar behaviour on this day of the 90th session, the whole presentation and procedure seemed somewhat 'staged'.

What many may not realise: Wodarg, Bhakdi and Reiß promised us in a meeting that they would be happy to discuss the topic of refuting the virus existence claim with us if we held back on pressing the issue with the Committee until after the Swiss referendum [13] on 13.06.2021 since the focus until then was on the vaccination issue.

However, we were the only ones who stuck 100% to this agreement ... hence the radio silence ... out of the naive hope that we all wanted the same thing: to find out the truth!

At the 90th session, Dr Wodarg revealed his true colours, and I quote:

"I WANT THIS ISSUE OFF THE TABLE TODAY".

What he is referring to here is the issue that there is no evidence of disease-causing viruses. For Wodarg, they must exist because, as he himself explained, 'diseases exist' and he cannot think of any other explanation in his limited biological view. If you are smiling now and feel transported back to the 1st grade - I felt the same way. Bottom drawer. We saw a classic circular reasoning a la: 'Because there are diseases, there are flying killer viruses and because there are vaccinations, there must also be the viruses'.

So now he had invited Dr Lanka to get 'the theory that there are no viruses' off the table - as declared by himself. This sounds like the kind of enthusiasm with which one finally completes a long-delayed, unloved task.

Dr. Wodarg reaches a height of absurdity by demanding that Dr. Lanka proves the non-existence of viruses - saying that until he does so they cannot continue talking!

But it is a fact of scientific theory and logic that the non-existence of something cannot be proven, only its existence can be proven. It is the duty of those who claim the existence of viruses to provide the proof. That is how it is done and not the other way around!

Dr. Lanka has already successfully refuted the alleged evidence that had been presented so far - but Dr. Wodarg's ears did not want to hear it.

It should be noted here that in science a theory only remains valid until it is disproved. This is called falsification. A single valid argument is enough, **it is not a matter of a majority decision.**

To sum it up a la Wodarg:

He is caught in the thicket of the belief in viruses and demands proof that he is wrong.

But he is not prepared to accept the evidence presented. To illustrate, one might just as well believe in Donald Duck - and if someone denies it, then demand proof from him that Donald Duck does not exist. "But he must exist, after all, there are many books, TV programmes with him and about him, even a Donaldist association - so why should one doubt his existence? Who on earth can plausibly explain to me that there is no Donald Duck?

For over a year now, Bhakdi, Wodarg and all other participants of the Corona Committee have been repeatedly encouraged by several people and major alternative channels to enter into dialogue with Dr. Stefan Lanka, Dr. Andrew Kaufman and Co. or to invite them to the Committee.

Despite these countless requests from so many people and although the committee invited statisticians and other specialists for the umpteenth time, the most important and decisive piece of the puzzle was still missing, namely Dr. Stefan Lanka's findings that there is no proof of a disease-causing virus! And I need to emphasise it here again clearly: with which **he already won a court case! [14]**

Not even after increasing numbers of scientists worldwide were willing to testify that the SARS-CoV-2 had not yet been isolated [15], was this piece of the puzzle important enough for the Corona Committee. What is one to make of this?

Dr. Wodarg, Prof. Bhakdi and Dr. Reiß were informed that Dr. Stefan Lanka had the control experiments carried out in Swiss laboratories, which are missing from all scientific publications yet are the duty of every scientist. Control experiments were made obligatory in 1998 by the DFG [16]. A paper that does not document these steps, meaning that they have not been carried out, may not be claimed to be scientific.

And now to the course of events in the 90th meeting of the Corona Committee

Quite calmly, Dr. Wodarg was able to paint his picture of viruses and vaccinations for just under an hour, managing to touch upon just about everything where one could be proven off the mark. He could not provide a single piece of evidence that could have supported his claims. Strangely,

neither Dr. Reiner Füllmich nor Viviane Fischer followed up - this circumstance alone had to convey to the viewer that what was said was correct and substantiated, since no one raised any objections. I felt like I was in the middle of a sales talk by a pharmaceutical salesman who was being monetarily rewarded for promoting the advantages of conventional vaccinations.

Here are a few examples in illustration:

1. *"The rabies viruses exist and they are deadly, vaccination against them is good"* ... that this idea goes back to the fraudster Louis Pasteur [17] apparently does not interest Wodarg - maybe he has simply forgotten.
2. *"Chickenpox [in German, 'Windpox'] is thus named because it can fly from door to door ..."*
3. *"The RKI is actually doing a very good job ..."* - this statement may come from the fact that he himself worked for the RKI, perhaps he still does? [18]
4. *"The flu vaccination is good and helps."* - it would have been enough to read our article on flu vaccinations [19] [20] to avoid making such a false statement.
5. *"Retroviruses exist ...and there are photographs of them."* - We can also remedy this point and refer to our HIV/AIDS article [21].
6. He told stories about how viruses work in the egg cell and that viruses existed long before humans....
7. He started talking about flower comparisons to explain viruses.
8. ... and many more crazy things ...

I do not want to repeat in this article everything we have already written in our articles [22] and in our book „Die Zeitzeugen Band 1.0" [The Historical Witnesses in Real-Time Volume 1.0"] [23]. That is why I refer to both here, you will find all refutations along with serious sources and statistics on the things that were claimed by Wodarg.

Before Dr. Stefan Lanka & Dr. Andrew Kaufman were finally allowed to take the microphone, a statistician who actually only regurgitated what one had already heard from several others of his species was granted the stage. With what felt like 100 slides, he overran his planned time window by far.

After almost 1 hour of delay, it was finally time for the premiere! For the very first time, the question of whether it had ever been possible to detect a disease-causing virus was to be discussed with the Corona Committee.

After being kept waiting, Dr. Andrew Kaufman began his presentation (in English). He presented all his points clearly, without any digressions, refuting the claim of the proof of a disease-causing virus. [24]

When he concluded his 26-minute lecture, the red pill was spat out. It was precisely at this point that Dr Wodarg could and should have asked the relevant questions.

However, he seemed so overwhelmed and at the same time perplexed by the length and depth of Kaufman's presentation that, after looking around for help, he said that he would prefer to listen to Dr. Lanka first so that he would not have to discuss things twice since he had so many questions.

The impression of many viewers: He had been knocked out standing up and was playing for time. As a strategy, he chose to attack Lanka via *ad hominem*s (financial interests, peer review), but we will come to that in a moment.

The German audience followed with the help of a simultaneous translation, however the translator was out of his depth and therefore it was a pure disaster. Even we found it a challenge to understand what Dr Kaufman was saying in the original.

Meanwhile, Dr. Stefan Lanka was kicked out of the stream several times and was forced to log in again each time. Only the gods know why this happened or who might have had a hand in it ...

While Dr. Stefan Lanka tried to present his findings and the causes for the misguided development within virology and medicine in layman's terms, he was interrupted by the lawyer Mrs. Viviane Fischer telling him that there was no time for such ramblings and diversions! This raises several questions:

- Why was so little time planned for this immensely important topic? Was more time actually promised, but deliberately reduced?
- Why was a statistician allowed to extend his time window excessively, even though he had nothing new to contribute?
- Why is one not simply granted the necessary time on what is probably the most central topic, especially when one of the guests, Dr Andrew Kaufman, is present from overseas?
- Why was Dr. Wodarg given such extended speaking time to presented his flawed mainstream virology, without interruption, for a whopping 45 minutes? This is particularly questionable in

that Wodarg already had had the opportunity to present his views several times in committee sessions.

- Why was Dr. Wodarg in attendance with the Committee for the presentation of Dr. Lanka and Dr. Kaufman at all? They knew nothing about this in advance.

After Dr. Lanka and Dr. Kaufman had presented some of their insights, an explicit, profound urge to research should actually have been awakened in an apparently ambitious scientist like Wodarg and likewise the lawyers.

But no, the committee and Wodarg seemed to be guided by other inclinations, they switched to personal attack. Wodarg was not in the least interested in Dr Kaufman's technical explanations and he only replied by way of, "... that if Dr Kaufman had no better explanation for diseases than viruses, then his assertions weren't relevant...".

The fact that his counterpart was wading in the mud and shooting blanks, for example, when it came to a question about the 'cause of a disease' was clearly recognised by Dr Kaufman. With this line of questioning, Dr Wodarg blustered his way through by directing the battle to side issues. Dr Kaufman confidently and skilfully parried the bullying on the part of Dr Wodarg by repeatedly making it clear that the objections expressed were irrelevant to the virus issue and that he should not distract from this!

After all, with the absence of evidence of a disease-causing pathogen the entire infection theory is falsified.

The two lawyers Füllmich and Fischer, with their wealth of experience, should have pointed this out to Wodarg - but they failed to do so. This only leads to the conclusion that we were experiencing a concerted effort, which, however, spectacularly backfired ...

Let that sink in: For the first time in two years, with 90 episodes so far and hundreds of participants, guests in the Corona Committee were outright attacked and one would have to be disingenuous not to have perceived the lack of impartiality in this hearing - But isn't objectivity exactly the mission that this Corona Committee has set for itself?!

Dr. Wodarg preferred not to respond to Dr. Kaufman's detailed and precise explanation of why a virus has never been isolated and its genome sequence never detected.

As early as last year in a 4-way video conference [25], at which point Dr Judy Mikovits still believed in viruses, Dr Kaufman parried with her in a similar way as he did with Wodarg in this 90th meeting of the Corona Committee. Dr Judy Mikovits, formerly a vaccine developer herself under Fauci, has since revised her view on viruses, as has Mike Adams of Natural News, which can certainly be considered quite significant in the USA.

But Wodarg stuck to his position of continuing to ignore the points articulated: that viruses have not been isolated and that their genome sequences are based only on computational constructs from a vast ocean of different, very short gene sequences. [26] [5]

Either Wodarg is shown to be out of his depth professionally or he ignored the facts for other reasons. He would have had enough time to acquire basic knowledge through preliminary talks or by means of the literature we have mentioned.

Upon hearing of the control experiments carried out by Dr. Lanka in Swiss laboratories which clearly provide the refutation of all claims about the existence of disease-causing viruses - the results of which are published for everyone to read [4] [5] and the methodologies of which can be reproduced by everyone, Wodarg responded only with attacks of a personal nature, accusing Dr. Lanka of having financial interests and of trying to create a diversion.

And as if that were not enough, Wodarg went even further out on a limb and accused Dr. Lanka of not publishing in the officially recognised scientific and medical magazines. Really??!!

What kind of second-rate theatre is Wodarg putting on here? Weren't we all led to believe that the committee was about acquiring new knowledge and new findings in order to be able to go to court in the best possible way, equipped on all sides and promising success?

Of course, Dr. Wodarg may be presumed to be intelligent enough to know that critical articles by Lanka, Kaufman, Cowan, Vollmer, Humphries, Wakefield etc. do not make it into the scientific magazines of orthodox medicine.

The fact that Wodarg nevertheless allowed himself to be drawn into this assertion in front of an audience indicates not only a possible cognitive dissonance (de docta ignorantia, recognising one's ignorance) but also, from a spiritual point of view, a character deficit. After all, that Wodarg's and Lanka's views are poles apart from the outset was no secret. Hypocritical.

Inviting an opposing party within the pandemic critics' camp and then to try to show them up is hardly to be surpassed in bigotry. This tactic is criticised when it is displayed by the pharmaceutical lobby and the health politicians, but it is practised even in the critics' camp. This is because it is a cultural, sociological phenomenon, which Dr. Lanka also tried to explain in an exemplary manner. Unfortunately here he was also interrupted because his reference to larger contexts probably exceeded Wodarg's limit of bearable.

A question that I personally ask myself: what impudence is employed by Dr. Wodarg to ignore arguments here - simply because they are not published in specialist journals of orthodox medicine, which are peer-reviewed? His behaviour is brazen, shameful and scurrilous, which is why it needs unpacking here:

Wodarg demanded that Dr Lanka publish in the scientific journals of official medicine, although Wodarg himself has not done so.

1. As an example of double standards, I am reminding everyone of the different vaccine batches that Yeadon presented to the Corona Committee - were these published and subjected to peer review so that this could be critiqued? No, of course not, but it was sufficient for Wodarg. Not so, however, with Dr. Lanka ...

2. Wodarg is well aware that this peer-review procedure has its pitfalls and very often slows down or prevents new findings.

3. The world-renowned Prof. John P. A. Ioannidis, one of the world's most cited scientists, published that more than half of the publications in scientific journals are wrong! [27]

4. the editors of the Lancet and the New England Journal of Medicine": [28]

The National Institutes of Health (NIH) published the following interesting article back in October 2015: Skeptical of medical science reports?

"It is simply no longer possible to believe much of the clinical research that is published, or to rely on the judgment of trusted physicians or authoritative medical guidelines. I take no pleasure in this conclusion, which I reached slowly and reluctantly over my two decades as editor of The New England Journal of Medicine."

"Recently, Richard Horton, editor of The Lancet, wrote that, *"The case against science is straightforward: much of the scientific literature, perhaps half, may simply be untrue. Afflicted by studies with small sample sizes, tiny effects, invalid exploratory analyses, and flagrant conflicts of interest, together with an obsession for pursuing fashionable trends of dubious importance, science has taken a turn towards darkness."*

Wodarg's killer argument is that if something does not appear in his prescribed science journals it is irrelevant, this is tantamount to the conclusion that any research by alternative journalists is worthless and therefore automatically wrong because it is not brought to the people via mainstream media - e.g. in the Spiegel or in the Tagesschau [e.g. such as the BBC or The Guardian newspaper].

This argumentation would also render any statement by Wodarg irrelevant!

The blatantly biased intervention in the discussion by Fischer and Füllmich was also striking. It would have been their task to intervene neutrally in the sense of referees. And to give Dr. Lanka sufficient time to speak, especially since he had been kept waiting for an inordinately long time beforehand. That was not only rude, but also unfair.

A glance at the Code of Guidelines for Safeguarding Good Scientific Practice -which was drawn up by an international commission on behalf of the German Research Foundation (DFG)[16] in 1997 and specified by universities and the German Rectors' Conference, published in print and on the internet and made binding in Germany for all state scientific institutions and scientists- would have sufficed, Mr Wodarg! These rules and specifications are part of the employment contract of each individual.

"The scientific quality of a contribution does not depend on the publication medium in which it is made publicly available."

Leitlinie 15: Publikationsorgan

- Autorinnen und Autoren wählen das Publikationsorgan – unter Berücksichtigung seiner Qualität und Sichtbarkeit im jeweiligen Diskursfeld – sorgfältig aus. Wissenschaftlerinnen und Wissenschaftler, die die Funktion von Herausgeberinnen und Herausgebern übernehmen, prüfen sorgfältig, für welche Publikationsorgane sie diese Aufgabe übernehmen. Die wissenschaftliche Qualität eines Beitrags hängt nicht von dem Publikationsorgan ab, in dem er öffentlich zugänglich gemacht wird.

Screenpresso.com

[16]

Gute wissenschaftliche Praxis

Kodex „Leitlinien zur Sicherung guter wissenschaftlicher Praxis“

Ziel des Kodex ist, es den Adressaten – den Wissenschaftlerinnen und Wissenschaftlern sowie den Leitungen von Hochschulen und außerhochschulischen Forschungseinrichtungen – zu ermöglichen, ihre internen Strukturen, Prozesse und Handlungen an den Leitlinien zur guten wissenschaftlichen Praxis auszurichten. Es soll eine Kultur der wissenschaftlichen Integrität in den wissenschaftlichen Einrichtungen verankert werden, die weniger die Verstöße gegen die gute wissenschaftliche Praxis in den Fokus nimmt, als vielmehr den Berufsethos der Wissenschaftlerinnen und Wissenschaftler.



Mit Inkrafttreten des Kodex zum 1. August 2019 müssen alle Hochschulen und außerhochschulischen Forschungseinrichtungen die 19 Leitlinien und ihre Erläuterungen rechtsverbindlich umsetzen, um Fördermittel durch die DFG erhalten zu können. Für diejenigen Hochschulen und außerhochschulischen Forschungseinrichtungen, die bereits die einschlägigen Regelungen der Denkschrift der DFG „Sicherung guter wissenschaftlicher Praxis“ rechtsverbindlich umgesetzt haben, besteht eine nunmehr dreijährige Übergangsfrist für die Umsetzung der Leitlinien des Kodex. Die Frist beginnt am 1. August 2019 und endet am 31. Juli 2022.

Screenpresso.com

My (really) last thoughts on this ...

Nowhere does it say that it is a condition that one may only disprove a theory if one has a better one ready. Even so, Dr. Lanka would have had a lot to offer, but he was simply not allowed to.

Instead, Dr Wodarg is allowed to publicly try to show him up and accuse him of 'secondary interests' after Lanka mentioned his self-made diagnostic device.

To hear this coming from the mouth of a book author (Wodarg) who himself has just returned from a promotional tour for his new publication, which revolves around the C-crisis and is presumably based on the prevailing virus theory. Conflict of interest? No, it's always the others who have that!

Dr Kaufman succeeded in calling out Dr Wodarg's insistence on asking the question of how else people get sick if there is no virus, for what it is: pure speculation, i.e. an assumption!

Kaufman also knew how to illustrate this, namely that Wodarg might just as well claim that an alien jumps from one human to another, causing illness. Here, too, it is merely an assertion for which there is no proof.

What he therefore succeeded in doing quite neatly was to separate the refutation of the proof of the virus from the question of the causes of a disease.

Anyone who cannot comprehend such simple logical connections, fact calling and observations proves themselves to be completely inept. Nil point! Fail!

Anyone who on top of this refuses to look at the control experiments that have already been carried out to refute the virus existence claim and who is also not prepared to carry them out together with us at our expense in order to take hold of the winning card in court against those responsible for the Corona Crisis - I am sorry to say that I must withdraw my confidence from them.

Two days later, an interview with Dr. Reiner Füllmich appeared on Bittel.TV, during which that 90th meeting of the Corona Committee was also discussed, the excerpt can be found here. [30]

Was it comedy ... or rather schizophrenic and for the loony bin? Füllmich portrayed Dr. Stefan Lanka as arrogant in the meeting and said that Dr. Andrew Kaufman and Dr. Lanka do not understand the question of the burden of proof and that a lawyer should explain it to them ... Is Dr. Reiner Füllmich's professional expertise insufficient for this task?

The proof was already provided in 2016 by determining the nucleic acid sequence of the measles virus. *[NB translator's note, error detected in the sentence, pending clarification from the author]*

According to his own statement, Füllmich considers the existence of the virus to be sufficiently proven.

This raises a few questions for us:

- Where?
- In which study exactly?
- Title and publication?

Notwithstanding all the refutations, they were not willing to let Dr Stefan Lanka present in peace. An unprepared Füllmich played dumb and accused Dr. Stefan Lanka and Dr. Andrew Kaufman of the facts he himself has suppressed...!

And if that wasn't enough satire, here's a cherry on top: Füllmich actually said that he didn't know how to argue a case when most experts believed in the virus

And now comes Law for Beginners: You have to present scientific evidence - not professions of faith! Surely a lawyer must be able to distinguish between an assertion by a scientist and scientific evidence? And if not, one should at least recognise one's professional limitations and delegate the case to a suitable colleague.

Dr. Stefan Lanka already has experience in court and told Reiner Füllmich during the Corona Committee meeting that no virologist would testify under oath to having conducted control experiments.

The excuses Füllmich uses to explain why he cannot raise the question of the existence of the virus in court are very curious: because the majority of experts believe in it and the knowledge is established. One might just as well apply this argumentation to everything else. One would not be able to address the tests, masks, distances, measures - in fact his whole committee would just be a waste of time because the majority sees it differently.

It's deplorable that some critical channels also support the science fraud in the fake virus studies, one always hears, 'it's the wrong time.' But it is precisely these critics who are sawing the branch they are sitting on, apparently not even aware of this.

There is simply no better time than now to ask this exact question about the evidence of a disease-causing virus! Dissenting views are only put forward by those who have simply not dealt with the facts of the unscientific nature of the publications.

Perhaps Füllmich should first attend to his own arrogance and be more polite to guests who hold a view that differs from his own. If he did not stifle findings that need to be presented, he would not later claim that they did not exist ... Simply bizarre. No wonder some people have a suspicion of conspiracy ...?

This committee is not part of any solution, but in many respects, part of the problem! Tunnel vision strategy. The inherent fraud that happens in virus studies that omit prescribed control trials must not be mentioned.

Apparently it was never about winning, but mainly about providing psychological support ... or was it really only about entertainment?

References:

[1] [Corona-Ausschuss - Sitzung 90: Das Virus der Macht](#)

[2] <https://corona-ausschuss.de/faq/>

[3] [Schriftlich bestätigt - Forscher können keinen Nachweis für ein krankmachendes Virus erbringen](#) | [\[Telegraph\]](#)

[Schriftlich bestätigt - TEIL 2 - Forscher können keinen Nachweis für ein krankmachendes Virus erbringen](#) | [\[Telegraph\]](#)

[4] Video-Interviews zu allen 3 Kontrollexperimenten seitens Dr. Stefan Lanka

[5] **Kontrollexperiment Phase 1** - [Wissenschaftplus Magazin 2021 Ausgabe 2 Seite 52](#)

Präliminäre Resultate der Kontrollversuche Die Reaktion primärer humaner Epithelzellen auf stringente Virusamplifikations-Bedingungen widerlegen die Existenzbehauptungen aller Viren und von SARS-CoV-2

Kontrollexperiment Phase 2 - [Wissenschaftplus Magazin 2021 Ausgabe 4 Seite 28](#)

Das Genom von SARS-CoV-2 wurde rein rechnerisch konstruiert - Eine Anleitung zu Widerlegung

[6] http://www.wissenschaftplus.de/uploads/article/Protokoll_13_4_20150001.pdf

[7] [Gerichtsprotokolle bestätigen: Kein wissenschaftlicher Nachweis für die Existenz des Masernvirus](#) | [\[Telegraph\]](#) | [\[MP3-Audio\]](#)

[8] [Corona Fakten & Samuel Eckert widerlegen Correctiv zum Masernprozess](#) | [\[Telegraph\]](#)

[9] [RKI bestätigt: Weder Viren-Existenzforschung, noch Kontrollexperimente durchgeführt](#) | [\[Telegraph\]](#)

[10] [FOIs zeigen, dass Gesundheits- / Wissenschaftseinrichtungen auf der ganzen Welt \(165 und mehr!\) keine Aufzeichnungen über die Isolierung / Reinigung von SARS-COV-2 haben, nirgendwo und jemals - Fluoridfreies Peeling \(fluoridefreepeel.ca\)](#)

[11] <https://www.samueleckert.net/isolate-truth-fund/>

[12] [Reicht eine Attacke auf den PCR-Test aus? Nicht ganz](#) | [\[Telegraph\]](#)

[13] https://t.me/Corona_Fakten/685

[14] [goVIRUSgogogo.pdf \(wissenschafttplus.de\)](#) - Der Bundesgerichtshof lässt den Glauben an die Viren untergehen von Dr. Stefan Lanka

Ergänzend können Sie dazu unsere ausführlichen Artikel mit allen Quellen, Prints und exklusivem Material lesen: Siehe Quelle [7] [8] [9]

[15] https://t.me/Corona_Fakten/777

Corona_Fakten präsentiert eine Reihe von Aussagen diverser Forscher, Wissenschaftler, Ärzten, Anwälten & mehr, die nach intensiver Recherche und eigenen Kontrollexperimenten zu dem eindeutigen Ergebnis gekommen sind - "ES EXISTIERT KEIN KRANKMACHENDES VIRUS"

[16] DFG: [Sicherung guter wissenschaftlicher Praxis Safeguarding Good Scientific Practice](#) | [\[Archiviert\]](#)

[17] Die [Princeton University](#) veröffentlichte die Untersuchung seiner Laboraufzeichnungen, bei deren Lektüre man zu dem Ergebnis kommen muss, dass Louis Pasteur seinerzeit massiv gelogen, betrogen und manipuliert hatte.

[18] In der Pandemie arbeitete DR. WORDAG BIS 2021 in einer GEN-Kommission des Robert Koch Institutes - ernannt vom Bundesministerium für Gesundheit <https://archive.md/KDXxR>

[19] [Die Grippe-Impfung ist nicht nur nutzlos, die Beteiligten wissen darüber Bescheid](#) | [\[Telegraph\]](#)

[20] [Die Grippe-Impfung ist ein Verbrechen – und das bereits seit 78 Jahren](#) | [\[Telegraph\]](#)

[21] [HIV & AIDS einfach und simpel demontiert - Die Parallelen zu SARS-CoV-2](#) | [\[Telegraph\]](#)

[22] [Corona_Fakten: Liste der wichtigsten Artikel ! – Telegraph](#)

[23] [Corona_Fakten & Ursula Stoll präsentieren ihr neues Buch - Die Zeitzeugen Band 1.0](#)

[24] [Dr. Andrew Kaufman & Dr. Stefan Lanka | Session 90: The Virus Of Power \[Englisch\]](#)

[25] Special Event Roundtable with Dr. Judy Mikovits discussing the magic virus and mRNA vaccines (**Beginnend ab Minute 22** <https://rumble.com/vd4c17-special-event-roundtable-with-dr.-judy-mikovits-discussing-the-magic-virus-.html>)

<https://rumble.com/vd4c17-special-event-roundtable-with-dr.-judy-mikovits-discussing-the-magic-virus-.html>

Ergänzend unser [Telegram-Post](#)

[26] Video - [Wie Virologen Virusgenome am Computer frei erfinden](#)

[27] John P. A. Ioannidis - [Why Most Published Research Findings Are False](#)

[28] NCBI - [Skeptical of medical science reports? - PMC \(nih.gov\)](#)

[29] [DFG - Gute wissenschaftliche Praxis Kodex „Leitlinien zur Sicherung guter wissenschaftlicher Praxis“](#)

[30] Bittel.TV- Zusammenfassung mit Reiner Füllmich - Corona-Ausschuss - Sitzung 90 <https://t.me/bitteltv/14467>